

**State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations
INFORMATION RESOURCES MANAGEMENT BOARD
Meeting Report**

Date/Place: January 4, 2001/Department of Administration, Providence, Rhode Island

Purpose: To receive presentations of IT Proposals for the FY 2002 Budget.

Members Present: Barbara Weaver, OLIS (Chair); James Berard, DOC; William Fagan, DLT; Janet Levesque, Cumberland PL; Dexter Merry, Public Telecommunications Authority; James R. Monti, Jr., West Warwick School Department; Thomas Mullaney, Budget Office—DOA; Joseph Pangborn, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education; Joan Ress Reeves, Library Board of RI; Bruce Reirden, Care New England; Kathleen Spangler, MHRH; Don Wolfe, Brown University

Members Absent: Robert Bromley, RI Senate Fiscal Office; Gary Ciminero, RI House Policy Office; William Ferland, OHE; Paul Gandel, URI; Gwenn Stearn, Secretary of State's Office

Other Attendees: Bea Frazer, Budget Office—DOA; Jay G. Lindgren, Jr., and Leon Saunders—DCYF; Connie McGreavy, Dimitry Kuchynski, and Thomas Palmer—WRB; Paul McLaughlin, DHS; Bruce Reid, Public citizen; Robert Salvas, EDS; Howard Boksenbaum, Patricia Chorney, Karen Mellor, and Beth Perry—OLIS

Reporting: Carol Ciotola, OLIS

Chair's Report—Ms. Weaver distributed:

- (1) *the finalized "State Government Information Technology Resource Use Policy"*—adopted at the Board's December meeting.
- (2) *a Progress Report on IRMB's Five-Year Plan*—The Chair will allow Board members several days for comment and will then forward the report to the Governor and the Legislature.
- (2) *a Statewide Standard Document for Information Technology Projects*—The Chair presented this for illustrative purposes. The state of Arizona uses this process, which has won an award from the National Association of State Information Resource Executives (NASIRE) for its completeness and thoroughness. For the FY 2003 budget, state departments will be required to submit IT proposals for IRMB evaluation and approval. **The following volunteered to serve on a committee to develop a process for evaluating state IT proposals: James Berard, William Fagan, Paul McLaughlin, and Kathleen Spangler.** Members asked that drafts produced during this process be made available to them for informational purposes.
 - Ms. Spangler pointed out that if departments are required to submit their budgets to the Board prior to submittal to the Budget Office—on or before October 1, a substantial time crunch would result. Ms. Weaver agreed. This year departments presented IT proposals to the Board for information only. If a process were in place by April, some information may be available by July that could be provided to the Board. Then IT proposals could be presented to the Board in September. Ms. Spangler asked if these submissions would be for new expenditures. Ms. Weaver said submissions for the FY 2003 budget would be for new expenditures but that eventually submissions would include all technology expenditures.
 - Mr. Fagan felt it important to distinguish between what constitutes an IT project and what constitutes a business improvement project.
 - Ms. Spangler recommended that the process include language to allow a department that has had a project rejected by the Board the opportunity to discuss the situation with them.

Ms. Weaver reported on an RFI for Letters of Interest for a Web Portal that would be developed by one or more vendors as a group, with no initial up-front investment by the state. The deadline date for responses was December 22. Five were received. Howard Boksenbaum will arrange for offeror presentations and will create a review team to evaluate the responses. Prior to next fiscal year, a contract should be in place for this work.

Ms. Weaver also reported on the RFP for evaluation and study of the Johnston Computer Center, to determine whether it would be feasible to turn it into a model IT Center, including training facilities, as well as to house the state's computer systems. OLIS received approval to hire Newport Collaborative Architects (NCA). There is funding budgeted to improve the Computer Center, but it must first be evaluated. NCA's contract to conduct this study also allows for evaluation of two other locations in the event that the Computer Center is found unsuitable.

Ms. Weaver stated that the Board is two and one-half years into its Five-Year Plan; thus an update is necessary. She suggested conducting a one-day retreat in March for members, with the aid of a professional facilitator, to see what could be developed for the next fiscal year. Mr. McLaughlin noted that members' attendance would depend on how much advance notice was given.

Board members voted to participate in a one-day retreat. The Chair will make the necessary arrangements and advise.

Legislation Committee Report—Mr. Wolfe reported that the proposed national UCITA law continues to be a concern for IT professionals and this Board. He sought Board approval to approach the Legislature with concerns and recommendations. **Members approved this request.** Mr. Wolfe will meet with the Legislation Committee to draft language.

Policy Committee Report—Dean Gandel was unable to attend this meeting, but had earlier asked the Chair to pose the following question to the membership: What activity should the Committee address next—security or privacy?

- Mr. Wolfe suggested working on both issues, since it is difficult to separate the two given the situation with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA). Mr. McLaughlin informed members that federal regulations are out for privacy. Regulations for security are due out on January 19.
- Ms. Spangler said that federal regulations are in place; statewide regulations are not. Ms. Weaver asked if there was any language, even in draft form, that would be useful to review. Mr. McLaughlin will provide the Chair with the information that he has. **Members agreed to share their information and thoughts with Mr. McLaughlin on this matter.**

Presentations of IT Proposals for FY 2002 Budget (These presentations were audiotaped):

Rhode Island Department for Children, Youth and Families—Mr. Lindgren distributed and reviewed a summary that presented DCYF's Children's Cabinet outcomes, vision, mission, guiding principles, its integrated system of care goals, and the Rhode Island Children's Information System (RICHIST). He then turned the program over to Mr. Saunders who reviewed DCYF's major technology initiatives and department and technical priorities for FY 2001/02, as well as other technology initiatives; namely: imaging, Internet, and mobile computing.

- Mr. Reirden asked if there has been any attempt to tie technology to "Outcomes and Goals" to show that these funds are being spent appropriately. Mr. Lindgren replied that the connection at this point is weak. He explained that the outcomes are intended to be very broad visionary statements, and not for measurement in and of themselves. Ms. Weaver noted that the Children's Cabinet is working on the Kids Link project, whereby, all information will be entered in the same way for every child to create an efficient tracking system. She said that this matter will be further discussed during review of the FY 2003 proposed IT projects.
- Mr. Berard offered his assistance to Mr. Saunders on the matter of document imaging, since DOC has done a lot of research in this area. Mr. Saunders accepted his offer of help, noting that it will be important to insure system compatibility.

Department of Elementary and Secondary Education—Mr. Pangborn distributed and reviewed a summary of the Department’s priority information technology plans for the next five years, as well as the Department’s IT mission statement, guiding philosophy, and its management information systems.

- Mr. Boksenbaum noted the importance of the Jason XII project; in that, if the Department can prove the need to have permanent access to Internet 2 (I2), it would bring economic development into the state. Internet 2 will allow for new high-speed applications, and is not currently available statewide.
- Mr. Reirden asked if the Department’s goals are tied in with technology. Mr. Pangborn said they do. In fact, he said he was told to start developing language for a student identifier project. There is no statewide system currently to track migration of children.
- Mr. Fagan said IT people recognize it as a general issue, while others view it as a technology issue. Policy decisions are not being made in a concerted effort. Ms. Spangler said that fundamentally it is viewed as a “privacy” issue. Ms. Spangler cited several examples showing the need to track children—none of which are technology issues. The first step is determining whether or not to have a tracking system. Ms. Weaver agreed, adding that once agreement is reached to go forward with a project such as this, technology enters the picture to determine the implementation approach. Basically, it’s a turf issue.
- Ms. Levesque asked about the composition of the Children’s Cabinet. Ms. Weaver noted that it consists of the directors of state departments that are involved with children’s services. It began as a legislative initiative to acknowledge that while DCYF has problems, other state departments share in them—DHS, DED, and DOH. Many others are involved with the Cabinet, such as provider agencies. Ms. Spangler explained that much of the work is done within a subcommittee structure, with the participation of schools, private/non-profits, and support at the community level. Ms. Weaver announced that there would be a presentation on library involvement in literacy programs at the next Children’s Cabinet meeting on January 10.

Next Meeting—February 8, 2001, DOA’s Conference Room “C” (2d floor)—IT proposals will be received from several divisions within the Department of Administration, and the Department of Environmental Management.